

REMARKS

The above amendment and these remarks are filed in response to the Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment, dated 19 Oct 2004.

Examiner Interview

Applicants' attorney expresses appreciation for courtesy extended by Examiner Raquel Alvarez in a telephone interview on 27 October 2004. At that time the undersigned clarified the requirements for correcting the errors in the previous amendment and determined that page 25 of that amendment was missing, at least in part, from the Office copy.

Comments

The Examiner requests that the identifier [previously amended] be changed to [previously presented]. Applicants have done so.

The Examiner also requests that claims 44-62 be listed in the listing of claims. On applicants copy of page 25 of

the amendment of 7/14/2004 these claims were included, as follows:

"44. [[Withdrawn -- Currently amended]..."

"Claims 45-62. [Canceled]"

In the above referenced interview, applicants' attorney determined that the Examiner's copy of the amendment filed on 7/14/2004 is missing page 25, at least in part. But, no matter. This response has the matter correctly stated.

In the following table, revised from the table originally provided in the Response/Amendment filed 4/20/04, applicants set forth their understanding of the renumbering and invention group assignments:

Current Claim Number	Original Claim Number	Invention Group
1	1	I
2	2	I
3	3	I
4	4	I
5	5	I
6	6	I
7	7	I

8	8	Canceled
9	9	I
10	10	I
11	11	I
12	12	I
13	13	I
14	14	I
15	15	I
16	16	I
17	20	I
18	33	I
19	34	I
20	36	I
21	48	I
22	50	IV
23	51	I
24	52	II
25	53	III
26	54	I
27	56	III
28	59	Not specified
29	37	IV
30	38	IV
31	39	IV
32	40	IV
33	41	IV
34	42	IV
35	43	IV

36	44	IV
37	45	IV
38	46	IV
39	47	V
40	55	I
41	57	I
42	17, 60	III
43	18, 61	III
44	19, 62	III
45-62	canceled without prejudice	various

Applicants urge that the above amendments be entered and the case passed to issue with claims 1-7, 9-21, 23, 26, 28, 40-41.

Claims 45-62 have been canceled without prejudice, inasmuch as the subject matter of these claims remains in the case, as is set forth in the above chart.

CONCLUSION


The Application is believed to be in condition for allowance and such action by the Examiner is urged. Should differences remain, however, which do not place one/more of the remaining claims in condition for allowance, or if this

Amendment is deemed Non-Compliant under 37 CFR 1.121, the Examiner is requested to phone the undersigned at the number provided below for the purpose of providing constructive assistance and suggestions in accordance with M.P.E.P. Sections 707.02(j) and 707.03 in order that allowable claims can be presented in a compliant manner for examination on the merits, thereby placing the Application in condition for allowance without further proceedings being necessary.

Sincerely,

E. B. Boden, et al.

By


Shelley M Beckstrand
Reg. No. 24,886

Date: 28 Oct 2004

Shelley M Beckstrand, P.C.
Attorney at Law
61 Glenmont Road
Woodlawn, VA 24381-1341

Phone: 276 238-1972